



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925, HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002  
PHONE - (713) 356-0060, FAX - (713) 356-0067, email gisb@aol.com  
Home Page www.gisb.org

January 8, 1999

**TO:** Common Codes Subcommittee chairs, Posting on the GISB home page for interested industry participants  
**FROM:** Rae McQuade, Executive Director  
**RE:** **Revised Final Minutes from the Common Codes Subcommittee Meeting--January 8, 1999**

## **I. Administrative**

The meeting opened with co-chairs Ms. Scott and Ms. Hopkins welcoming the participants to the meeting and giving antitrust advice. Ms. Scott covered housekeeping items as the host for the meeting. Antitrust guidelines were given by Ms. McQuade. The attendees introduced themselves. The agenda was adopted. The minutes of October 20, 1997 were adopted with changes. The minutes of November 10, 1998 were adopted with changes.

## **II. Entity Common Code Issue**

Mr. Lander described the issue as the use of D-U-N-S® Number for several business relationships which was further elaborated by Ms. Hess who described the processes. Each process was identified which required a common entity code, the communicating parties for those processes were identified, and the data elements in those business processes that require a common code. It was expected that this exercise (of identifying the needs for common entity code) should provide further information on whether the HQ level of the D-U-N-S® Number is workable or whether a finer level of detail (such as branch location) is needed. The results of the discussion were:

1. Process Set: Nominating, Scheduling, Pre-determined Allocation (PDA), Allocating, Imbalance and Invoicing  
Communicating Parties: Service Requester (SR) to Transportation Service Provider (TSP), TSP to SR, TSP to Up/Down Entity  
Data Elements: Service Requester, Upstream ID, Downstream ID, TSP ID, Preparer ID, Recipient ID, Replacement Party ID, Remitting Party, Remit To Party, Billable Party, Payee
2. Process Set: Nominating, Scheduling, PDA, Measurement and Allocating  
Communicating Parties: TSP to Confirming Party  
Data Elements: Confirmation Requester, Confirming Party, Service Requester, Up/Down ID, Confirmation Service ID, Statement Recipient ID, Preparer ID, Meter Operator
3. Process Set: Capacity Release  
Communicating Parties: TSP to everyone  
Data Elements: TSP, Bidder, Releasor, Requester, Withdrawing Company, Return Addressee, Requesting Company Code

The two questions to be considered against the above information are: (1) Should GISB support the same code level for all three sets of processes? or (2) Should different code levels be used depending on the process? As a threshold question, is the HQ level of the D-U-N-S® Number sufficient to support the use of common code across and within the sets of processes defined? If the answer is no, the reasons should be clearly identified. A lunch break was taken while the participants considered the questions posed.



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925, HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002  
PHONE - (713) 356-0060, FAX - (713) 356-0067, email gisb@aol.com  
Home Page www.gisb.org

---

After lunch the questions were reviewed with the following discussion:

- ✓ Is the HQ level sufficient to support the use of common code across and within the process sets defined?

The answer to this question was no for a variety of reasons:

1. No -- because PI up/down lower level is needed to identify distinct parties.
2. No -- use of only the HQ level can cause a miscommunication of intent.
3. No -- Ford Motor Company example as given in the November 10, 1998 meeting minutes.
4. No -- some customers have indicated that they do not want to change to use HQ.

The following question was posed to further understanding:

- ✓ Does GISB care which common code is used? If a company specifies the common code to be used at the HQ level or at another level, why would GISB care which level is selected?

An opinion was expressed that GISB should not care. Another opinion was expressed that for simplicity and to ensure uniqueness, when HQ works, it should be used.

During discussion, it was noted that rules should be developed for when companies depart from the use of HQ level common codes. Rather than "rules", GISB should identify why and under what circumstances companies depart from using HQ level common codes. Where HQ is not used, some reasons cited for such are:

1. Some customers have demanded use of the branch level for accounting reasons.
2. Some contracting parties provide common codes at the branch level.
3. Some pipelines noted that there are parties that they do business with that do not have common codes assigned.
4. When the transacting party is not at the HQ level.

To accommodate existing business practices, common codes at HQ level only are not sufficient. Mr. Scheel made the motion which was seconded to adopt the following principle, which was later amended to a concept:

C1 The entity common code should not be limited to the headquarters/single location level only of the D-U-N-S® Number.

and was accepted by the subcommittee unanimously.

In continuance of discussion on the questions "(1) Should GISB support the same code level for all three sets of processes? or (2) Should different code levels be used depending on the process?," the motion was made and seconded to adopt the following concept or working definition to add structure during the discussion:

C2 An Entity is a person or organization with sufficient legal standing to enter into a contract or arrangement with another such person or organization (as such legal standing may be determined by those parties) for the purpose of conducting and/or coordinating natural gas transactions.

Mr. Lander responded to questions regarding the proposed definition for Entity and why a definition was required. Concern was voiced that this definition is so broad that it does not exclude any party and as such does not add any structure to support the discussion on the two questions. Mr. Lander responded that "person" is used in the legal sense, and that this definition is not meant to exclude, but



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925, HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002  
PHONE - (713) 356-0060, FAX - (713) 356-0067, email gisb@aol.com  
Home Page www.gisb.org

rather is meant to include parties to a transaction. The HQ level of the D-U-N-S® Number does exclude parties -- this definition is not meant to exclude those parties to a transaction. The motion passed with four abstentions.

While another question was phrased by Mr. Lander as: "Should the same entity be identified with the same code for all sets of processes?", the conversation returned to Question 1: "Should GISB support the same code level for all three sets of processes?' It was discussed that for a specific entity, GISB should support the same entity common code across all process sets to support integration of systems regardless of the level chosen for that entity. As such the response to Question 1 was no, with all participants in agreement.

For Question 2 - "Should different code levels be used depending on the process?", for the same reason stated to the first question the response was no, with all participants in agreement. There are still issues regarding the level of the common code (HQ/Branch or other). To date, the subcommittee supported the following concepts:

- o GISB should not support a single level for all process sets. (answer to question 1)
- o GISB should not support specific levels for given process sets. (answer to question 2)
- o GISB should not support the use of HQ level only. (concept 1)

Level may affect the uniqueness of the code for the transactions and may support additional benefits of credit checking. Further discussions on level will be held at the next meeting. On Question 3 as posed by Mr. Lander: "Should the same entity be identified with the same code for all processes?", it will be discussed at the next meeting. Guidelines on which level is used for a given entity will be discussed at the next meeting.

Mr. Lander then reviewed his work paper, (posted for the meeting). After questions, it was noted that the Board is committed to working with D &B and more information on current discussions with D&B should be available before the next meeting. The work paper and the discussion should not be construed as lack of support for the use of the D-U-N-S® Number in GISB standards.

### III. Meeting Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m. The next meeting is on February 5 from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. in Houston, hosted by Enron Capital and Trade. The agenda will be posted shortly and will focus on the level of the common code to be used (HQ, branch, or another type).

### IV. Attendance

Name	Company	Phone/Fax/Email	Member <sup>1</sup>	Voting <sup>2</sup>
James, Doug	ANR	(713) 877-3688/not specified douglas.james@coastalcorp.com	✓	✓
Barnum, Betty	Duke - Panhandle Eastern	(713) 627-5618/(713) 627-5769 babarnum@duke-energy.com	✓	✓
Langford, Janet	Duke - Panhandle Eastern	(713) 627-4775/(713) 989-1548 jdlangford@duke-energy.com	✓	✗



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925, HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002  
PHONE - (713) 356-0060, FAX - (713) 356-0067, email gisb@aol.com  
Home Page www.gisb.org

Name	Company	Phone/Fax/Email	Member <sup>1</sup>	Voting <sup>2</sup>
Stewart, Larry	Duke - Texas Eastern	(713) 627-4248/(713) 627-4066 lstewart@duke-energy.com	✓	✓
Scheel, Mark	Dynegy	(713) 507-6787/(713) 507-6834 masc@dynegy.com	✓	✓
Hobson, W. Frank	El Paso Natural Gas	(713) 496-2962/not specified hobsonw@epenergy.com	✓	✓
Hopkins, Tammy	Enron - Florida Gas	(713) 853-5818/(713) 853-6756 thopkins@enron.com	✓	✓
Scott, Donna	Enron Administrative Corp	(713) 853-7148/(713) 646-2372 dscott2@ect.enron.com	✓	✓
Payne, Gary	Enron Capital and Trade	(713) 853-7148/not specified gpayne@ect.enron.com	✓	✓
Solmonson, Mary	Enron Capital and Trade	(713) 853-6079/not specified msolmon@ect.enron.com	✓	✗
Colbert, Marilyn	Enron Capital and Trade	(713) 853-6517/not specified email: not specified	✓	✗
Hess, Theresa	Enron - Transwestern	(713) 853-4895/not specified thess@enron.com	✓	✓
McQuade, Rae	GISB	(713) 356-0060/(713) 356-0067 gisb@aol.com	✓	n/a
Garcia, JoAnn	GISB	(713) 356-0060/(713) 356-0067 gisb4@aol.com	✓	n/a
Young, Randall	Koch Midstream Services	(713) 544-4715/(713) 544-5112 young0r@kochind.com	✓	✓
Gracey, Mark	Tennessee Gas Pipeline	(713) 420-2644/(713) 420-3284 graceym@epenergy.com	✓	✓
Lander, Greg	TransCapacity	(978) 535-7500/(978) 535-7744 exec@tcapserv.com	✓	✓
Keisler, Jim	Transco	(713) 215-4322/(713) 215-4770 jim.e.keisler@wgp.twc.com	✓	✓



# Gas Industry Standards Board

1100 LOUISIANA, SUITE 4925, HOUSTON, TEXAS, 77002  
PHONE - (713) 356-0060, FAX - (713) 356-0067, email gisb@aol.com  
Home Page [www.gisb.org](http://www.gisb.org)

---

Name	Company	Phone/Fax/Email	Member <sup>1</sup>	Voting <sup>2</sup>
Davis, Dale	Williams Gas Pipelines	(713) 215-2396/(713) 215-3946 dale.m.davis@wgp.twc.com	✓	✓

<sup>1</sup> The member column indicates which companies are GISB members for 1999. Members accrue benefits which are available to non-members at a charge. Individuals that transfer to member companies after they have participated in GISB meeting as a non-member can have their status changed through a letter from the member company CEO.

<sup>2</sup> Only one representative per company can vote at a GISB meeting.